arXiv:hep-th/0012111v1 13 Dec 2000

APPLICATIONS OF EXACT RENORMALIZATION GROUP TECHNIQUES TO THE NON-PERTURBATIVE STUDY OF SUPERSYMMETRIC GAUGE FIELD THEORY

S. ARNONE
Department of Physics and Astronomy,
University of Southampton
Highfield, Southampton SO17 1BJ, U.K.
E-mail: sa@hep.phys.soton.ac.uk

S. CHIANTESE AND K. YOSHIDA
Dipartimento di Fisica,
Università degli Studi di Roma "La Sapienza"
P.le Aldo Moro, 2 - 00185 Roma, Italia
and
I.N.F.N., Sezione di Roma I
E-mail: stefano.chiantese@roma1.infn.it, kensuke.yoshida@roma1.infn.it

Exact Renormalization Group techniques are applied to supersymmetric models in order to get some insights into the low energy effective actions of such theories. Starting from the ultra-violet finite mass deformed $N = 4$ supersymmetric Yang–Mills theory, one varies the regularising mass and compensates for it by introducing an effective Wilsonian action. (Polchinski's) renormalization group equation is modified in an essential way by the presence of rescaling (*a.k.a.* Konishi) anomaly, which is responsible for the beta-function. When supersymmetry is broken up to $N = 1$ the form of effective actions in terms of massless fields is quite reasonable, while in the case of the $N = 2$ model we appear to have problems related to instantons.

1 Introduction

An important feature of supersymmetric gauge field theories (supersymmetric Yang–Mills (SYM), supersymmetric QCD (SQCD), etc.) is that one can obtain the so called "exact results" for certain general class of models.

One part of these exact results is the "non-renormalization theorem", which allows one to severely restrict the form of the effective (Wilsonian) action[1].

Now all such "exact results" are generally demonstrated by usual renormalized perturbation techniques, assuming moreover the existence of a finite cutoff preserving the relevant symmetries, *i.e.* rigid supersymmetry and gauge symmetry.

Beyond this, one adds the effect of instantons and appeals to the absence (in the case of supersymmetric models) of perturbative corrections to it.

It is clear that as long as one relies on such techniques, one remains in the regime of semi-classical approximations and the results obtained are, in principle, valid in the weak coupling limit only.

There are of course more direct, truly non-perturbative methods which are based on the straightforward evaluation of the relevant path integrals. They are:

I. the lattice approximation[2];

II. the Exact Renormalization Group (ERG) approach[3,4].

With these techniques, one has the possibility of altogether leaving the semi-classical regime and obtaining truly non-perturbative (exact) results. Unfortunately, both methods suffer from "technical" problems that cause their applications to supersymmetric (SUSY) gauge field theories (GFT) to be rather problematic at present. In the lattice approximation, one has to deal with the problem of proper lattice definition of chiral or Weyl fermions (*i.e.* neutrinos), which makes the realization of SUSY on the lattice difficult. In the ERG approach, on the other hand, one encounters the difficulty of defining a cutoff scheme which is compatible with gauge symmetry at arbitrary finite cutoff value.

Recently, there has been considerable progress in understanding both of these problems, *i.e.* chiral fermions on the lattice[5] and gauge invariance of ERG[6]. However, this progress is still far from producing simple and exact rules to be applied to the actual calculations and demonstrations of theorems.

In the present note, we would like to propose a method which, in view of the difficulty encountered with gauge invariance, circumvents the cutoff problem in the ERG approach. In fact, our method consists in reformulating *à la* Polchinski[3] the original ideas by Arkani-Hamed and Murayama[7,8].
Just as in the case of[7,8], the main ingredients of our methods are the following:
I. the existence of ultra-violet (UV) finite models with extended supersymmetry;
II. rescaling anomaly in $N=1$ SUSY GFT (Konishi anomaly) which influences the relevant ERG equation in an essential way[12,13].
We will explain these ideas in what follows below.

2 UV finite models and their mass deformations

The authors of[7,8] have "regularised" $N=1$ SUSY GFT as the mass deformation of $N=4$ SYM theory. Similar models (the so called $N=1^*$ models) have been studied by several authors in different contexts[9].

The model is given by the classical action $S^* = S_{N=4} + \frac{1}{2}\int d^4x\, d^2\theta \sum_{i=1}^3 M_i^0 \varphi_i^2 +$ *h.c.*, which reads (written in terms of $N=1$ superfields and in the "holomorphic" representation)

$$S^*(V,\varphi_i,\overline{\varphi}_i;g_0) = \frac{1}{16}\int d^4x\, d^2\theta \frac{1}{g_0^2} W^a_\alpha W^{a\alpha} + \int dx\, d^4\theta\, \Re e\left(\frac{2}{g_0^2}\right) t_2(A) \sum_{i=1}^{3} \overline{\varphi}_i e^V \varphi_i + \\ + \int d^4x\, d^2\theta\, \Re e\left(\frac{1}{g_0^2}\right) \sqrt{2}\,\mathrm{Tr}\left(\varphi_i\left[\varphi_j,\varphi_k\right]\right) \frac{\epsilon^{ijk}}{3!} + \frac{1}{2}\int d^4x\, d^2\theta \sum_{i=1}^{3} M_i^0 \varphi_i^2 + h.c. \tag{1}$$

This model, just as the original $N=4$ SYM theory without mass terms, is believed to be finite. It has been shown that, at the perturbative level, all the UV divergences cancel out[10]. Kovacs[11] has analysed again this model and his calculations bear out the older claims.

At the perturbative level, the model suffers from apparently severe infra-red (IR) divergences, which are, however, totally absent in the particular choice of gauge $\alpha=1$[11]. One may hope, therefore, that there is no divergence at all in gauge invariant correlation functions.

In this note, we take up the most (and perhaps unjustifiably) optimistic point of view, *i.e.* that the model is really finite at the non-perturbative level and the quantum partition function

$$Z = \int \mathcal{D}[V] \prod_{i=1}^{3} \mathcal{D}[\varphi_i]\, \mathcal{D}[\bar{\varphi}_i] \exp i \left[S^*(V, \varphi_i, \overline{\varphi}_i; g_0) + \text{sources} \right] \tag{2}$$

can be well defined, perhaps with the usual procedure of gauge fixing[a].

As for the physics represented by eq. (2), while at large energy scales, $M_i^0 < p$, the model approaches $N=4$ SYM, at low energies, $p << M_i^0$, $N=4$ supersymmetry is broken and models with heavy fields decoupled, such as $N=1$, are obtained.

In what follows, we simplify the analysis by choosing the same mass for some of the chiral superfields while keeping the others massless

$$\sum_{i=1}^{3} M_i^0 \varphi_i^2 \;\Rightarrow\; M_0 \sum_{i=1}^{\mu} \varphi_i^2, \quad \mu = 1, 2, 3. \tag{3}$$

Then at low energies we expect:
I. $\mu = 3 \quad \Rightarrow N=1$ SYM;
II. $\mu = 2 \quad \Rightarrow N=2$ SYM;
III. $\mu = 1 \quad \Rightarrow N=1$ SQCD with one hypermultiplet in the adjoint representation.

3 Analysis of mass deformed $N=4$ SYM ($N=1^*$ models)

We study the model given by eq. (1) for the restricted case, eq. (3). We start from the path integral expression

$$Z_{M_0} = \int \mathcal{D}[V] \prod_{i=1}^{3} \mathcal{D}[\varphi_i]\, \mathcal{D}[\bar{\varphi}_i] \exp i \left[S^*(V, \varphi_i, \overline{\varphi}_i; g_0) + \text{sources} \right], \tag{4}$$

where S^* is the $N=4$ action deformed by the addition of $\frac{1}{2} M_0 \sum_{i=1}^{\mu} \varphi_i^2$.

As we have argued in the previous section, we assume Z_{M_0} to be well defined, free from divergences even at the non-perturbative level[11].

3.1 $\mu = 3$ case

We give the same mass, M_0, to all the chiral superfields, $(\varphi_i)_{i=1}^{3}$. At low energies, $p << M_0$, the model must approach $N=1$ SYM and M_0 can be identified as the UV cutoff of such theory.

ERG analysis

As in the conventional ERG analysis[3] with momentum cutoff Λ, one tries to vary the mass parameter, M_0, to a lower value, M, while keeping physics unchanged[8].

---

[a] $\mathcal{D}[V]$ is meant to include accompanying ghosts.

More precisely, we look for the effective "Wilsonian" action S_M such that

$$\begin{aligned} Z_{M_0} = Z_M \equiv \int \mathcal{D}[V] \prod_{i=1}^{3} \mathcal{D}[\varphi_i]\,\mathcal{D}[\bar{\varphi}_i] \exp i \Big[S_M(V,\varphi_i,\overline{\varphi}_i) + \frac{M}{2} \int d^2\theta \sum_{i=1}^{3} \varphi_i^2 + h.c. + \\ + \int d^2\theta \sum_{i=1}^{3} f(M)\, J_i\, \varphi_i + h.c. + \frac{1}{2} \int d^2\theta \sum_{i=1}^{3} g(M)\, J_i^2 + h.c. + \int d^4\theta\, J_V V \Big]. \end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

Eq. (5) is the rewriting of eq. (4) where the change in the mass parameter, $M_0 \to M$, is being compensated for by the change in the action, $S_{N=4} \to S_M$, as well as by the renormalization of external sources[b] represented by the functions $f(M)$ and $g(M)$.
Just as in the case of the usual ERG approach, S_M is expected to be non-renormalizable and, in general, not even local.

To find the equation satisfied by S_M, one might proceed as in[13], where the original method by Polchinski[3] is closely followed. However, here we would like to apply the "field redefinition" (FRD) approach proposed by Morris[14,15]. This method allows us to treat from a unified point of view the wider class of ERG equations we want to deal with later on.

Let us write down the generating functional, eq. (5), as $Z_M = \int \mathcal{D}[V] \prod_{i=1}^{3} \mathcal{D}[\varphi_i]\,\mathcal{D}[\bar{\varphi}_i] \exp i S_M^{tot}$ and split S_M^{tot} into $S_M^0 + S_M^1$, with the former being the mass deformation, $\frac{M}{2} \int d^2\theta \sum_{i=1}^{3} \varphi_i^2 + h.c.$, and the latter standing for S_M and the renormalized source terms as well (cf eq. (5)).

We introduce the RG flow generating function (the "RG kernel" according to Morris[14]),

$$\Psi_i(x; M) = \frac{1}{2M^2} \frac{\delta}{\delta \varphi_i(x)} \left(S_M^1 - S_M^0 \right), \tag{6}$$

and the corresponding infinitesimal change of variables

$$\varphi_i \to \varphi_i + \delta\varphi_i \equiv \varphi_i + \delta M\, \Psi_i(x; M). \tag{7}$$

Under the FRD transformation, eq. (7), Z_M must remain invariant

$$0 = \delta_\Psi Z_M = \delta M \int \mathcal{D}[V] \prod_{i=1}^{3} \mathcal{D}[\varphi_i]\,\mathcal{D}[\bar{\varphi}_i] \Big\{ \int \Big(\frac{\delta \Psi_i(x)}{\delta \varphi_i(x)} + i \Psi_i(x) \frac{\delta S_M^{tot}}{\delta \varphi_i(x)} \Big) + h.c. \Big\} e^{i S_M^{tot}}. \tag{8}$$

In the r.h.s. of eq. (8), the first term is the Jacobian for the functional measure under the transformation eq. (7) while the second term is the variation of S_M^{tot}.

One can write eq. (8) in short hand as

$$\Big\langle \int \Big(\frac{\delta \Psi_i(x)}{\delta \varphi_i(x)} + i \Psi_i(x) \frac{\delta S_M^{tot}}{\delta \varphi_i(x)} \Big) + h.c. \Big\rangle = 0. \tag{9}$$

The above relations are trivial, however eq. (9) implies that if S_M^{tot} varies with M according to

$$\Big\langle M \partial_M S_M^{tot} - M \int \Big(\frac{\delta \Psi_i(x)}{\delta \varphi_i(x)} + i \Psi_i(x) \frac{\delta S_M^{tot}}{\delta \varphi_i(x)} \Big) - h.c. \Big\rangle = 0, \tag{10}$$

---

[b] We have anticipated the necessity for a contact term.

then Z_M stays unchanged under the infinitesimal change $S_M \to S_{M+\delta M}$.

Eq. (10) corresponds to the weak form of Polchinski's equation[3].

One might ask here whether it is possible to take away the functional average sign $\langle\cdot\rangle$ and satisfy the strong form of Polchinski's equation

$$M\partial_M S_M^{tot} = M\int\left(\frac{\delta\Psi_i(x)}{\delta\varphi_i(x)} + i\Psi_i(x)\frac{\delta S_M^{tot}}{\delta\varphi_i(x)}\right) + h.c. \tag{11}$$

We will comment on this later on and, for the moment, carry on with the original equation (10). Substituting eq. (6) into eq. (10) yields[c]

$$\begin{aligned}\Bigg\langle M\partial_M S_M - \frac{1}{2M}\int\left(i\frac{\delta^2 S_M}{\delta\varphi_i(p)\,\delta\varphi_i(-p)} - \frac{\delta S_M}{\delta\varphi_i(p)}\frac{\delta S_M}{\delta\varphi_i(-p)} - iM\frac{\delta\varphi_i(p)}{\delta\varphi_i(p)}\right) - h.c. + \\ + \int\left(f - M\partial_M f\right) J_i(p)\,\varphi_i(-p) + \frac{1}{2M}\int\left(f^2 - M^2\partial_M g\right) J_i(p)\,J_i(-p) + h.c.\Bigg\rangle = 0.\end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

If the source term renormalization factors satisfy the differential equations $M\partial_M f = f$ and $M^2\partial_M g = f^2$ with the initial conditions $f(M_0) = 1$ and $g(M_0) = 0$, then eq. (12) takes the form

$$\Bigg\langle M\partial_M S_M - \frac{1}{2M}\int\left(i\frac{\delta^2 S_M}{\delta\varphi_i(p)\,\delta\varphi_i(-p)} - \frac{\delta S_M}{\delta\varphi_i(p)}\frac{\delta S_M}{\delta\varphi_i(-p)} - iM\frac{\delta\varphi_i(p)}{\delta\varphi_i(p)}\right) - h.c.\Bigg\rangle = 0. \tag{13}$$

It is easy to solve the differential equations for f and g, the solutions corresponding to the given initial conditions being $f(M) = \frac{M}{M_0}$ and $g(M) = \frac{1}{M_0}\left(\frac{M}{M_0} - 1\right)$.

Eq. (13) has the same form as Polchinski's except for the presence of the singular term $\Delta = -\frac{i}{2}\left\langle\int\frac{\delta\varphi_i(p)}{\delta\varphi_i(p)}\right\rangle$. Such a term, discarded in Polchinski's original work, is of great importance when dealing with SUSY GFT, as we pointed out in[13].

Indeed, Δ is closely related to the anomalous Jacobian (Fujikawa-Konishi determinant) under the rescaling transformation $\varphi_i = \exp[\delta\alpha]\,\varphi_i'$, where $\delta\alpha$ is a chiral superfield as well.

$$J(\delta\alpha) = \det\left(\frac{\delta\varphi_i}{\delta\varphi_i'}\right) = 1 + i\int\delta\alpha\frac{1}{8}\frac{t_2(A)}{8\pi^2}W_\alpha^a W^{a\alpha} + \mathcal{O}(\delta\alpha)^2, \tag{14}$$

where $t_2(A)$ is the Dynkin index of the adjoint representation of the gauge group and for $SU(N_C)$ one has $t_2(A) = N_C$. Then, as we have shown in[13],

$$\langle\Delta\rangle = \frac{1}{16}\frac{t_2(A)}{8\pi^2}\int W_\alpha^a W^{a\alpha} \tag{15}$$

Substituting eq. (15) into eq. (13) after summing upon i and assuming the strong form for the rest of the equation, *i.e.* taking away the functional average sign, one gets

$$M\partial_M S_M = \frac{1}{2M}\int\sum_{i=1}^{3}\left(i\frac{\delta^2 S_M}{\delta\varphi_i(p)\,\delta\varphi_i(-p)} - \frac{\delta S_M}{\delta\varphi_i(p)}\frac{\delta S_M}{\delta\varphi_i(-p)}\right) + \frac{3}{16}\frac{t_2(A)}{8\pi^2}\int W^2 + h.c., \tag{16}$$

---

[c] Following Polchinski, we have gone over to the momentum representation

which is the main result in[13].

One can explicitly separate from S_M the contribution of the anomalous term by introducing the "normal" part of the action, $\tilde{S}_M$,

$$\tilde{S}_M \doteq S_M - \frac{3}{16}\frac{t_2(A)}{8\pi^2}\int W^2 \log\left(\frac{M}{M_0}\right) + h.c. \tag{17}$$

It satisfies Polchinski's equation (without the anomalous term Δ)

$$M\partial_M \tilde{S}_M = \frac{1}{2M}\int\sum_{i=1}^{3}\left(i\frac{\delta^2 \tilde{S}_M}{\delta\varphi_i(p)\,\delta\varphi_i(-p)} - \frac{\delta\tilde{S}_M}{\delta\varphi_i(p)}\frac{\delta\tilde{S}_M}{\delta\varphi_i(-p)}\right) + h.c. \tag{18}$$

The variation of the gauge coupling constant

As it has been argued in[13], one expects the contribution of the anomalous part to be dominant at $M \neq M_0$. In fact $\tilde{S}_M \sim \tilde{S}_{M_0} + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{M}, \frac{1}{M_0}\right)$. Thus, at low energies, one may read off the variation of the gauge coupling constant from Δ, eq. (15)

$$\frac{1}{g^2(M)} - \frac{1}{g^2(M_0)} = \frac{3\,t_2(A)}{8\pi^2}\log\left(\frac{M}{M_0}\right). \tag{19}$$

This is the variation of the "holomorphic" gauge coupling constant. One can go over to the more conventional canonical representation by rescaling all the superfields by the canonical gauge coupling, *i.e.* $\varphi_{(h)} = g_c\,\varphi_{(c)}$, $\overline{\varphi}_{(h)} = g_c\,\overline{\varphi}_{(c)}$ and $V_{(h)} = g_c\,V_{(c)}$, and, of course, taking into account the effect of Konishi anomaly in such a transformation. We refer to[8] for the details and simply quote the result

$$\beta(g_c) = M\partial_M g_c(M) = -\frac{\dfrac{3}{16\pi^2}\,t_2(A)\,g_c^3}{1 - \dfrac{t_2(A)}{8\pi^2}\,g_c^2}. \tag{20}$$

Eq. (20) is the celebrated Novikov-Shiffman-Vainshtein-Zakarov (NSVZ) exact expression of the β-function in $N=1$ SYM.

The infinite-M_0 limit

The conventional infinite-M_0 limit is defined by the conditions $M_0 \to \infty$ and $g(M_0) \to 0$ in such a way as to keep the dynamical cutoff $\Lambda = M_0 \exp - \left(\frac{8\pi^2}{g_0^2}\frac{1}{3N_C}\right)$ fixed. According to eq. (19), Λ is the value of M at which $g(M)$ diverges.
Then, again with $\tilde{S}_M \sim \tilde{S}_{M_0}$, one gets

$$S(M) \sim \frac{1}{16}\int\left[\frac{1}{g_0^2} + \frac{3N_C}{8\pi^2}\log\frac{M}{M_0}\right]W^2 + h.c. = \frac{1}{16}\frac{3N_C}{8\pi^2}\int\log\left(\frac{M}{\Lambda}\right)W^2 + h.c. \tag{21}$$

In this limit, the theory is a pure $N=1$ SYM.

3.2 $\mu = 2$ case

One can trivially extend the previous analysis to the case when only two of the three chiral superfields in the $N=4$ SYS get massive, *i.e.* one adds the mass term $S^0_{M_0} = \frac{M_0}{2}\int d^2\theta \sum_{i=1}^{2}\varphi_i^2 + h.c.$

Note that $S^0_{M_0}$ is $N=2$ SUSY invariant, thus one expects that the original $N=4$ SYM gets broken up to a $N=2$ model ($N=2$ SYM).

Repeating the method explained above, one obtains the analog of eq. (17) for the effective action as

$$\tilde{S}_M \doteq S_M - \frac{2}{16}\frac{t_2(A)}{8\pi^2}\int W^2 \log\left(\frac{M}{M_0}\right) + h.c., \tag{22}$$

where $\tilde{S}_M$ again satisfies Polchinski's equation with respect to the heavy fields $\varphi_{1,2}$.

The variation of the gauge coupling constant can be obtained in the same way as before; the result for the canonical β-function is

$$\beta(g_c) = M\partial_M g_c(M) = -\frac{2}{16\pi^2}\, t_2(A)\, g_c^3, \tag{23}$$

this representing the well known fact that the β-function of $N=2$ SYM is one-loop exact.

In the infinite-M_0 limit with fixed $\Lambda = M_0 \exp -\left(\frac{8\pi^2}{g_0^2}\frac{1}{2N_C}\right)$

$$S(M) \sim \frac{1}{16}\frac{2N_C}{8\pi^2}\int \log\left(\frac{M}{\Lambda}\right) W^2 + h.c. + \varphi_3 \,\text{kinematical term}. \tag{24}$$

The coefficient of such a kinematical term is completely determined by $N=2$ SYM[8].

3.3 $\mu = 1$ case

Let us give mass to just one of the three chiral superfields in the $N=4$ SYM, say φ_1. Then the mass term reads $S^0_{M_0} = \frac{M_0}{2}\int d^2\theta \varphi_1^2 + h.c.$
The effective action is defined by

$$S_M = \tilde{S}_M + \frac{1}{16}\frac{t_2(A)}{8\pi^2}\int W^2 \log\left(\frac{M}{M_0}\right) + h.c., \tag{25}$$

where $\tilde{S}_M$ is now contributed by the chiral kinematical terms $\sum_{i=2}^3 \overline{\varphi}_i e^V \varphi_i$. In contrast with the previous $\mu = 2$ case, the coefficients of such terms at arbitrary mass M are no more constrained by SUSY and, thus, one must write them as $Z(M, M_0)\sum_{i=2}^3 \overline{\varphi}_i e^V \varphi_i$.

Rescaling superfields so as to cancel this Z factor yields an extra contribution to the W^2 term

$$\frac{1}{g^2(M)} - \frac{1}{g^2(M_0)} = \frac{t_2(A)}{8\pi^2}\left[\log\frac{M}{M_0} - 2Z(M, M_0)\right]. \tag{26}$$

4 Generalised RG flow

In sec. 3 we have seen that the RG flow with respect to the variation of the mass parameter is generated by the continuous FRD $\delta\varphi_i = \delta M\, \Psi_i(x; M)$, where the generating function Ψ_i is defined in eq. (6).
We have chosen S^0_M to be the mass term in S^{tot}_M; however, in the case of $\mu = 1, 2$ one may try a more general form of S^0_M - or of $S^0_{M_0}$ which, because of the flow equation, determines S^0_M uniquely.

Note, first of all, the fact that in these cases the characteristic trilinear term in the $N=4$ action is either linear or quadratic in the massive chiral superfields. Thus, for the $\mu=1,2$ cases, it is natural to try using the following "quadratic" actions as $S^0_{M_0}$

I. $\mu=1 \Rightarrow S^0_{M_0} = \frac{M_0}{2}\int d^2\theta\varphi_1^2 + \int\Big(\vec{J}_1 + i\alpha\vec{\varphi}_2 \wedge \vec{\varphi}_3\Big)\cdot\vec{\varphi}_1 + h.c.,\ \alpha \doteq \Re e\left(\frac{2\sqrt{2}}{g_0^2}\right) t_2(A);$

II. $\mu=2 \Rightarrow S^0_{M_0} = \frac{M_0}{2}\int d^2\theta\sum_{i=1}^2\varphi_i^2 + i\alpha\int(\vec{\varphi}_1\wedge\vec{\varphi}_2)\cdot\vec{\varphi}_3 + \sum_{i=1}^2 J_i\,\varphi_i + h.c.$

To see whether these quadratic actions generate a consistent RG flow, let us consider a generic S^0_M with both quadratic and linear couplings

$$S^0_M = \frac{1}{2}\int\varphi_i\,\mathcal{M}_{ij}(M)\,\varphi_j + h.c. + \int J_i\,\mathcal{F}_{ij}(M)\,\varphi_j + h.c. + \int J_i\,\mathcal{G}_{ij}(M)\,J_j + h.c., \quad (27)$$

where the matrices $\mathcal{M},\mathcal{F}$ and $\mathcal{G}$ can depend on the physical massless fields, *i.e.* $(V,\varphi_k,\overline{\varphi}_k)_{\mu+1\leq k\leq 3}$.
The RG flow is now generated by the FRD $\delta\varphi_i = \delta M\,\Psi_i$ with[d]

$$\Psi_i(x;M) = \frac{1}{2M^2}\frac{\delta}{\delta\varphi_i(x)}\left(S_M - S^0_M\right) = \frac{1}{2M^2}\left(\frac{\delta S_M}{\delta\varphi_i(x)} - \mathcal{F}_{ij}\,J_j - \mathcal{M}_{ij}\,\varphi_j\right). \quad (28)$$

Applying the above FRD to the generating functional yields

$$\begin{aligned}&\Bigg\langle M\partial_M S_M - \frac{1}{2M}\int\!\!\left(i\frac{\delta^2 S_M}{\delta\varphi_i(x)\,\delta\varphi_i(x)} - \frac{\delta S_M}{\delta\varphi_i(x)}\frac{\delta S_M}{\delta\varphi_i(x)} - i\mathcal{M}_{ij}\,\frac{\delta\varphi_j(x)}{\delta\varphi_i(x)}\right) - h.c. +\\ &+\frac{1}{2}\int\!\!\left(\frac{1}{M}\varphi^T\mathcal{M}^2\varphi - \varphi^T M\partial_M\mathcal{M}\,\varphi\right) + h.c. + \int\!\!\left(\frac{1}{M}J^T\mathcal{F}\mathcal{M}\,\varphi - J^T M\partial_M\mathcal{F}\,\varphi\right) +\\ &+\frac{1}{2}\int\!\!\left(\frac{1}{M}J^T\mathcal{F}^2 J - J^T M\partial_M\mathcal{G}\,J\right) + h.c.\Bigg\rangle = 0.\end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

One sees that S_M satisfies Polchinski's equation with the anomalous term provided that the M-dependent matrices $\mathcal{M},\mathcal{F}$ and $\mathcal{G}$ are chosen in such a way as to satisfy

$$M\partial_M\mathcal{M} = \frac{1}{M}\mathcal{M}^2, \qquad M\partial_M\mathcal{F} = \frac{1}{M}\mathcal{F}\mathcal{M}, \qquad M\partial_M\mathcal{G} = \frac{1}{M}\mathcal{F}^2. \quad (30)$$

Rewriting eq. (29) in the strong form

$$M\partial_M S_M = \frac{1}{2M}\int\!\!\left(i\frac{\delta^2 S_M}{\delta\varphi_i(x)\,\delta\varphi_i(x)} - \frac{\delta S_M}{\delta\varphi_i(x)}\frac{\delta S_M}{\delta\varphi_i(x)} - i\mathcal{M}_{ij}\,\frac{\delta\varphi_j(x)}{\delta\varphi_i(x)}\right) + h.c. \quad (31)$$

Eq. (31) has the same form as eq. (16) except for the anomalous term which, however, in the cases of interest can be reduced to the previous case. The important difference is its initial condition: S_{M_0} does not contain the characteristic trilinear term in the $N=4$ action which has been explicitly separated and included in S^0_M and, as a consequence, it is just $N=1$ invariant. We will comment further on this issue in sec. 5.

---

[d] As S^0_M now contains the renormalized source terms too, S^1_M is just the Wilsonian action, S_M.

The matrix differential equations, eq. (30), with the initial conditions $\mathcal{M}(M_0) = \mathcal{M}_0$, $\mathcal{F}(M_0) = \mathbb{1}$ and $\mathcal{G}(M_0) = 0$ can be easily integrated by noting that $[\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{M}_0] = 0$. One gets

$$\mathcal{M}^{-1} - \mathcal{M}_0^{-1} = \frac{1}{M} - \frac{1}{M_0} \doteq \frac{1}{\tilde{M}}, \qquad \mathcal{F} = \mathcal{M}\mathcal{M}_0^{-1}, \qquad \mathcal{G} = \mathcal{M}\mathcal{M}_0^{-2} - \mathcal{M}_0^{-1}. \quad (32)$$

These results can be applied to the specific examples listed at the beginning of sec. 4.

4.1 $\mu = 1$ *case*

This is the simpler case because the mass matrix, $\mathcal{M}$, is just a number, the regularising mass M.
Eq. (27) takes the form

$$S_M^0 = \frac{M}{2}\int d^2\theta\, \varphi_1^2 + h.c. + \frac{M}{M_0}\int \left(\vec{J}_1 + i\alpha\vec{\varphi}_2 \wedge \vec{\varphi}_3\right) \cdot \vec{\varphi}_1 + h.c. + \frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{M}{M_0^2} - \frac{1}{M_0}\right) \times \\ \times \int \left(\vec{J}_1 + i\alpha\vec{\varphi}_2 \wedge \vec{\varphi}_3\right)^2 + h.c. \quad (33)$$

The total action, S_M^{tot}, is obtained by adding to eq. (33) the effective action, S_M, and the (un-renormalized) source terms for massless fields.
S_M should satisfy Polchinski's equation with the anomalous term, which can be again evaluated by Konishi anomaly. It reads $\Delta = \frac{1}{16}\frac{t_2(A)}{8\pi^2}\int d^2\theta\, W^2$.

Getting rid of Δ by defining $\tilde{S}_M = S_M - \frac{1}{16}\frac{t_2(A)}{8\pi^2}\int W^2 \log\left(\frac{M}{M_0}\right) + h.c.$, one obtains the effective action for low energy physical configurations, *i.e.* $\vec{J}_1 = \vec{\bar{J}}_1 = \vec{0}$ and $p \lesssim M << M_0$

$$S_M = \frac{1}{16}\frac{t_2(A)}{8\pi^2}\int \log\left(\frac{M}{\Lambda}\right) W^2 + \frac{\alpha^2}{2M_0}\int (\vec{\varphi}_2 \wedge \vec{\varphi}_3)^2 + h.c. + \int \Re e\left(\frac{2}{g_0^2}\right) t_2(A) \sum_{i=2}^{3} \overline{\varphi}_i e^V \varphi_i, \quad (34)$$

where $\Lambda = M_0 \exp -\left(\frac{8\pi^2}{g_0^2}\frac{1}{t_2(A)}\right)$.

The notable feature of eq. (34) is the effective four-field interaction. Moreover, it is not necessary to integrate out the massive φ_1 field to get it. Another important feature of the above equation is that, in contrast to sec. 3, there is no way of getting the non-trivial wave function renormalization constants of massless $\varphi_{2,3}$.

4.2 $\mu = 2$ *case*

Giving the same mass M_0 to φ_1 and φ_2, one expects the resultant theory to be $N = 2$ SUSY. The issue is whether one can get some information about the low energy effective action of *e.g.* $N=2$ SYM after the heavy fields decouple.

Note that $S_{M_0}^0$ by itself is not $N = 2$ invariant, as it does not contain, by construction, the required kinetic terms for the massive chiral superfields.

The generalised mass matrix in S_M^0, $\mathcal{M}_{ia,jb}(M)$ (ij run from 1 to 2 whereas ab label the adjoint representation of $SU(N_C)$), can be written down as $\mathcal{M} =$

$\mathcal{M}_0\left(\mathbb{1}-\frac{\mathcal{M}_0}{M}\right)^{-1}$, with the initial value being read off from $S^0_{M_0}$

$$(\mathcal{M}_0)_{ia,jb} = M_0\delta_{ij}\,\delta_{ab} + i\alpha\varphi^c f^{cab}\varepsilon_{ij}. \tag{35}$$

Hereafter we will refer to the massless physical field,φ_3, as φ. Thus, in eq. (35), $\varphi^c \equiv \varphi^c_3$; f^{cab}'s are $SU(N_C)$ structure constants.

For later purpose it is convenient to introduce a new matrix, Φ, defined by $\Phi \doteq \exp\left[\mathcal{M}\mathcal{M}_0^{-1}\right]$. Φ satisfies $M\partial_M\Phi = \frac{\mathcal{M}}{M}$ with $\Phi(M_0)=0$.

From eq. (35) one can compute the matrix element $\Phi_{ia,jb}$.
We give here the explicit result for $N_C = 2$

$$\Phi_{ia,jb}(M) = \delta_{ij}\,\delta_{ab}\log\frac{M}{M_0} - \frac{1}{2}\delta_{ij}\left(\delta_{ab}-\frac{\varphi^a\varphi^b}{\varphi^2}\right)\log\left(1+\frac{\alpha^2\varphi^2}{M_0^2}\left(1-\frac{M}{M_0}\right)^2\right)+$$
$$+\frac{1}{\sqrt{\varphi^2}}\varphi^c\epsilon_{abc}\varepsilon_{ij}\log\left(\frac{1-i\frac{\alpha}{M_0}\sqrt{\varphi^2}\left(1-\frac{M}{M_0}\right)}{1+i\frac{\alpha}{M_0}\sqrt{\varphi^2}\left(1-\frac{M}{M_0}\right)}\right) \tag{36}$$

As before, $S^{tot}_M = S^0_M + S_M +$ unrenormalized source terms and the Wilsonian effective action is again split as $S_M = \tilde{S}_M + S^{anom}_M$, where the latter is the anomalous contribution. $\tilde{S}_M$ satisfies the anomaly free Polchinski's equation

$$M\partial_M\tilde{S}_M = \frac{1}{2M}\int\sum_{i=2}^{3}\left(i\frac{\delta^2\tilde{S}_M}{\delta\varphi_i(x)\,\delta\varphi_i(x)} - \frac{\delta\tilde{S}_M}{\delta\varphi_i(x)}\frac{\delta\tilde{S}_M}{\delta\varphi_i(x)}\right)+h.c. \tag{37}$$

with the reduced initial condition, *i.e.* the initial value S_{M_0} does not contain the trilinear coupling $\varphi_3\cdot\varphi_1\wedge\varphi_2$.

As for the anomalous part, one can easily appreciate it is given by

$$S^{anom}_M = -\frac{i}{M}\left\langle\int\Phi_{ia,jb}\frac{\delta\varphi^b_j}{\delta\varphi^a_i}\right\rangle + h.c. \tag{38}$$

As in the previous cases, one expects the dominance of S^{anom}_M over $\tilde{S}_M$.

To obtain the explicit expression of the anomalous contribution, we work assuming the following simplifying conditions:
I. the gauge group is $SU(2)$;
II. we specialise to the massless sector, *i.e.* to the configuration which remains massless in the classical vacuum represented by the vacuum expectation value (vev) $\langle\varphi\rangle = (0,0,a)$

$$\vec{V} = (0,0,V) \qquad \vec{\varphi} = (0,0,\varphi) \qquad \vec{\bar{\varphi}} = (0,0,\bar{\varphi}). \tag{39}$$

For such a configuration, the relevant matrices $\mathcal{M},\mathcal{F}$ become diagonal. In particular, from eq. (36)

$$\Phi = \left\{\log\frac{M}{M_0} - \frac{1}{2}\log\left(1+\frac{\alpha^2\varphi^2}{M_0^2}\left(1-\frac{M}{M_0}\right)^2\right)\right\}\mathbb{1} + \frac{1}{2}\log\left(\frac{1-i\frac{\alpha\varphi}{M_0}\left(1-\frac{M}{M_0}\right)}{1+i\frac{\alpha\varphi}{M_0}\left(1-\frac{M}{M_0}\right)}\right)\sigma_3, \tag{40}$$

where $\sigma_3 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}$.

In the massless sector, it is convenient to make heavy field variables, $\varphi_i^a, i = 1,2, a = 1,2$, undergo the following linear transformation while keeping φ_i^3 unchanged

$$\begin{cases} \varphi_1^1 = \frac{1}{2}\left[\left(\tilde Q_1 - i\tilde Q_2\right) + (Q_1 + iQ_2)\right], & \varphi_1^2 = \frac{1}{2i}\left[\left(\tilde Q_1 - i\tilde Q_2\right) - (Q_1 + iQ_2)\right], \\ \varphi_2^1 = \frac{1}{2}\left[\left(\tilde Q_1 + i\tilde Q_2\right) + (Q_1 - iQ_2)\right], & \varphi_2^2 = \frac{1}{2i}\left[\left(\tilde Q_1 + i\tilde Q_2\right) - (Q_1 - iQ_2)\right]. \end{cases} \tag{41}$$

In terms of the new variables, $\left(Q_i, \tilde Q_i\right)_{i=1}^2$, the heavy field gauge couplings become

$$\sum_{i=1}^{2} \bar\varphi_i^a \left(e^{\widehat V}\right)_{ab} \varphi_i^b = \sum_{i=1}^{2} \left(Q_i^\dagger e^{-V} Q_i + \tilde Q_i e^V \tilde Q_i^\dagger + \bar\varphi_i^3 \varphi_i^3\right), \tag{42}$$

with $\widehat V = V\sigma_3$.

Thus the calculation of the anomaly reduces to

$$-\frac{i}{2}\left\langle \int \frac{\delta Q_i(p)}{\delta Q_i(p)} \right\rangle = -\frac{i}{2}\left\langle \int \frac{\delta \tilde Q_i(p)}{\delta \tilde Q_i(p)} \right\rangle = \frac{1}{16}\frac{1}{8\pi^2}\int W^2. \tag{43}$$

From eqs (41), (43)

$$S_M^{anom} = \frac{1}{16}\frac{1}{4\pi^2}\left[\log\left(\frac{M}{M_0}\right)^2 - \log\left(1 + \frac{\alpha^2\varphi^2}{M_0^2}\left(1 - \frac{M}{M_0}\right)^2\right)\right] W^2 + h.c. \tag{44}$$

On the other hand, Polchinski's equation for the non-anomalous action, $\tilde S_M$, reads

$$M\partial_M \tilde S_M = \frac{1}{M}\int \sum_{i=1}^{2}\left(i\frac{\delta^2 \tilde S_M}{\delta \tilde Q_i(p)\,\delta Q_i(-p)} - \frac{\delta \tilde S_M}{\delta \tilde Q_i(p)}\frac{\delta \tilde S_M}{\delta Q_i(-p)}\right) + h.c., \tag{45}$$

with the initial condition

$$\tilde S_{M_0} = 2\int d^4\theta \sum_{i=1}^{2} \mathcal{R}e\left(\frac{2}{g_0^2}\right)\left(Q_i^\dagger\, e^{-V} Q_i + \tilde Q_i\, e^V \tilde Q_i^\dagger\right) + \text{irrelevant terms}. \tag{46}$$

In the end we obtain the approximate expression of the Wilsonian effective action

$$S_M = -\frac{1}{64\pi^2}\int\left[\log\left(\frac{\Lambda}{M}\right)^2 + \log\left(1 + \frac{\alpha^2\varphi^2}{M_0^2}\left(1 - \frac{M}{M_0}\right)^2\right)\right] W^2 + \varphi\,\text{kinetic term}, \tag{47}$$

with Λ being $M_0 \exp - \left(\frac{2\pi^2}{g_0^2}\right)$.

Apart from the first logarithmic term, which is the same as in eq. (24), eq. (47) is not very satisfactory[17,18]. The obvious trouble with our method is the fact that $N=2$ SYM is not maintained at an arbitrary value of M. It is actually broken in

two different (independent) places:
I. $S^0_{M_0}$ is not $N=2$ invariant and neither is $\mathcal{M}(M;\varphi)$;
II. Konishi anomaly is evaluated with $N=1$ but not $N=2$ symmetric regulator[12].

Now, $N=2$ generalization of[12] has been proposed in[8]. If one followed their method directly, one would end up with an effective action of the form[8]

$$S_M = \frac{1}{16\pi^2}\int\left[F(\varphi^2)\, W^2 + h.c. + \bar{\varphi}\, F(\varphi^2)\, \varphi\right], \tag{48}$$

which is $N=2$ symmetric only if $F(\varphi^2)$ is constant. As it is well known[19], in fact, the general $N=2$ symmetric action would be of the form

$$S_M \propto \int\left(4\varphi^2 f'' + 2f'\right)\, W^2 + h.c. + 2\int\bar{\varphi}\,(2f')\,\varphi, \tag{49}$$

with $f = f(\varphi^2)$.

5 Conclusions

As we have seen, by applying ERG techniques to mass deformed models, one arrives at reasonable results when the residual supersymmetry (after heavy fields decouple) is $N=1$. This is true for both UV finite $N=4$ SYM and $N=2$ SQCD.

Apart from the correct expression of the relevant beta functions (NSVZ and generalizations), we have obtained low energy effective actions for "massless" fields which are consistent with known results[17,18].

It appears that the inability to construct a manifestly $N=2$ symmetric RG flow in our context always causes troubles. One interpretation is that the final state the system flows into after heavy fields have decoupled, is not the pure $N=2$ state but a mixture of $N=1$ and $N=2$ states instead[21].
At present, we do not know how to remedy such a situation by, *e.g.* , projecting the final state into pure $N=2$.

It is not true, however, that the effective action in eq. (47) is totally fictitious. Inspecting the expression and comparing it with the correct expression[17,18] one notes the absence of what can be interpreted as instanton contributions.
Indeed, eq. (47) can be rewritten, in the massless sector, as

$$S(M) = \frac{1}{16}\frac{1}{4\pi^2}\int\sum_{\pm}\left[\frac{2\pi^2}{g_0^2} - \log\left(\frac{M_0 \pm i\alpha a}{\Lambda}\right)\right], \tag{50}$$

which is consistent with the result on $N=2$ SQED in[18] (there is no instanton in SQED).
It contrasts with the derivation of NSVZ beta function, in which case instanton effects need not be taken into account separately.

All these facts seem to indicate that though our method is capable of revealing part of the non-perturbative structure of low energy super gauge field theory, on the other hand there are still some important elements lacking.

One must also mention that recently a series of remarkable insights into this class of quantum field theory models - including a simple derivation of Seiberg-Witten results - are getting discovered by "stringists". The main techniques here are brane technology and AdS/CFT correspondence. It is left to see whether this state of affairs really means that the super gauge field theory is just a "spin off" (in the sense of E. Witten) of super string theory, or M theory.

References

1. S.Weinberg, "The quantum theory of fields", Vol III Supersymmetry § 27.6 (Cambridge University Press, UK, 2000).
2. K.G. Wilson, *Phys. Rev.* **D 10** (1974) 2445;
   K.G. Wilson in *New Phenomena in Subnuclear Physics* (Erice '75), ed. A. Zichichi (Plenum Press, New York, 1977);
   K.G. Wilson in *Recent Developments in Gauge Theories* (Cargese '79), ed. G. 't Hooft (Plenum Press, New York, 1980).
3. J. Polchinski, *Nucl. Phys.* **B 231** (1984) 269.
   G. Gallavotti, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **57** (1985) 471.
4. C. Becchi, "On the costruction of renormalized quantum field theory using renormalization group techniques', lectures given at the Parma theoretical Physics Seminar, Sept 1991. (Eds M. Bonini, G. Marchesini and E. Onofri). Revised and issued as `hep-th/9607188.`
   C. Wetterich, *Phys. Lett.* **B 301** (1993) 90.
   T.R. Morris, *Int. J. Mod. Phys.* **A 9** (1994) 2411.
   U. Ellwanger, *Phys. Lett.* **B 335** (1994) 364.
   M. D'Attanasio and T.R. Morris, *Phys. Lett.* **B 378** (1996) 213, `hep-th/9402077.`
   M. Bonini and G. Marchesini, *Phys. Lett.* **B 389** (1996) 566, `hep-th/9402077.`
   M. Bonini and F. Vian, *Nucl. Phys.* **B 532** (1998) 473, `hep-th/9802196.`
   S. P. de Alwis, "Remarks on supersymmetric effective actions and supersymmetry breaking", `hep-th/9508053` (unpublished).
5. H. Neuberger, *Phys. Rev.* **D 59** (1999) 085006, `hep-lat/9802033.`
   M. Lüscher, *Phys. Lett.* **B 428** (1998) 342, `hep-lat/9802011;`*Nucl. Phys.* **B 568** (2000) 162, `hep-lat/9904009.`
6. T.R. Morris, "A manifestly gauge invariant exact renormalization group", `hep-th/9810104;`*Nucl. Phys.* **B 573** (2000) 97, `hep-th/9910058;`"A gauge invariant renormalization group II", `hep-th/0006064.`
   S. Hirano, *Phys. Rev.* **D 61** (2000) 125011, `hep-th/9910256;`
   D.L. Litim and J.M. Pawlowski, "On Gauge Invariant Wilsonian Flows", `hep-th/9901063;`
   K. Kubota and H. Terao, *Prog. Theor. Phys.* **102** (1999) 1163, `hep-th/9908062;`
   M. Simionato, *Int. J. Mod. Phys.* **A 15** (2000) 2121; *Int. J. Mod. Phys.* **A 15** (2000) 2153.
7. N. Arkani-Hamed and H. Murayama, *Phys. Rev.* **D 57** (1998) 6638, `hep-th/9705189`
8. N. Arkani-Hamed and H. Murayama, *J. High Energy Phys.* **0006** (2000) 030, `hep-th/9707133.`
9. J. Polchinski and M.J. Strassler, "The String Dual of a Confining Four-

Dimensional Gauge Theory", `hep-th/0003136.`

10. M.F. Sohnius and P.C. West, *Phys. Lett.* **B 100** (1981) 245;
    S. Mandelstam, *Nucl. Phys.* **B 213** (1983) 149;
    A.J. Parkes and P.C. West, *Phys. Lett.* **B 122** (1983) 365.
11. S. Kovacs, "A perturbative re-analysis of N=4 supersymmetric Yang–Mills theory", `hep-th/9902049;`
    S. Kovacs, PhD Thesis, April 1999, `hep-th/9908171.`
12. K. Konishi and K. Shizuya, *Nuovo Cim.* **A90** (1985) 111.
13. S. Arnone, C. Fusi and K. Yoshida, *J. High Energy Phys.* **0002** (1999) 022, `hep-th/9812022.`
14. See T.R. Morris, `hep-th/9810104.`
15. J.I. Latorre and T.R. Morris, *J. High Energy Phys.* **0011** (2000) 004, `hep-th/0008123.`
16. D.R.T. Jones, *Phys. Lett.* **B 123** (1983) 45.
    V. Novikov, M. Shifman, A. Vainshtein and V. Zakharov, *Nucl. Phys.* **B 229** (1983) 381.
    See also M. Shifman and A. Vainshtein, *Nucl. Phys.* **B 277** (1986) 456.
17. N. Seiberg and E. Witten, *Nucl. Phys.* **B 426** (1994) 19.
18. N. Seiberg and E. Witten, *Nucl. Phys.* **B 430** (1996) 485.
19. See, for instance, M. Peskin, in *Fields, Strings and Duality*, Boulder, Colorado, June 1996, `hep-th/9702094.`
20. For the correct singularity structure of $N=2$ theory, see[17,18,19].
21. We thank T. Kitao for the inspiring discussion on this point.